

REMARKSI. Response to RestrictionA. Provisional Election and Traversal

Applicants hereby provisionally elect Group II, Claims 15-19, this election being with traverse.

It is submitted that 10-14 and 20 are properly considered with the claims of Group II because the relationship between what the Examiner has identified as different species. However it is submitted that there is a commonality of function between the claim groups. For example in either Claim 10 (of Group I) and Claim 15 (of Group II) the sensor array is arranged at a tilt angle  $\alpha$  with respect to the optical path with the image is collected at various rotational angles while maintaining the tilt angle  $\alpha$ . Thus it is submitted that the Office Action has not established sufficient basis for insisting upon the restriction and it is requested that the restriction be removed.

B. Presentation of Generic Claim

In the event the restriction is not removed, it is submitted that new Claim 30 is a generic claim and upon allowance of that claim, the restricted claims should be examined. MPEP § 806.04(d).

III. Conclusion

Claims 10-20 are pending in the present application. New Claims 21-33 have been added by this Amendment. It is submitted that new Claims 21-33 are properly considered within Group II.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 28, 2004

By: John Rafter  
John A. Rafter, Jr.  
Reg. No. 31,653

Customer No. 33451  
STOEL RIVES LLP  
900 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2600  
Portland, OR 97204-1268  
Telephone: (503) 224-3380  
Facsimile: (503) 220-2480  
Attorney Docket No. 51306/757:1